

Bl
enc.

a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, the sheet material comprising an uppermost sub-layer having a first length and at least one underlying sub-layer arranged under the uppermost sub-layer and having a second length, wherein the first length is substantially equal to the second length.--

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Final Office Action of August 29, 2002 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this amendment, Applicant adds new claim 24. Applicant respectfully submit no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10-24 remain pending within the present application.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,739,880).

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a second substrate having first and second surfaces, wherein the first surface is disposed against the first substrate; a non-transparent film coated on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film." None of the cited references including the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 10-14, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "providing a second substrate having first and second surfaces, wherein the first surface is disposed against the first substrate; coating a non-transparent film on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and disposing a sheet material between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film." None of the cited references including the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 and claims 16-23, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner cites the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 as disclosing "a first sheet material (10) disposed between the light source (20) and the second substrate (6), and at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) is not directly under the black matrix (26) (as the non-transparent film)..." and that the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 "discloses a black pattern (24) (non-transparent film) is printed on the left edge of the protective sheet (10a) and it is on the lower surface of the second substrate (6). The Examiner then asserts the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 "does not expressly disclose a non-transparent film coated on periphery of the second surface (lower surface) of the second substrate." In attempting to cure the deficiencies of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, the Examiner cites Suzuki et al. as disclosing "...a liquid crystal display device having a shield tape (TAPE) is stuck to the lower face of the lower substrate (SUB1)... The shield tape (TAPE) is

along the seal member (SL)... such that the shield tape (TAPE) is coated on the periphery of the lower face of the lower substrate. ” The Examiner then concludes “it would have been obvious to... use a non-transparent black film coated on periphery of the lower surface of the lower substrate...”

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the combination of the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits, even if Suzuki et al. were properly combinable with the teachings of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, the Examiner’s cited combination would still fail to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned claim limitations. For example, Applicant respectfully submits the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 shows wherein the black matrix (26) is arranged between an upper glass substrate (4) and a lower glass substrate (6). Further, Applicant respectfully submits, Suzuki et al. does not cure the deficiencies of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, with respect to the aforementioned elements of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill to combine the cited references and arrive at the claimed invention with any reasonable expectation of success.

Independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 24 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a second substrate having first and second surfaces, wherein the first surface is disposed against the first substrate; a non-transparent film coated on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, the sheet material comprising an uppermost sub-layer having a first length and at least one underlying sub-layer arranged under the uppermost sub-layer and having a second length, wherein the first length is substantially equal to the second length.” None of the cited references including the

related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 10-14, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP

Date: December 29, 2002

By 

Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No: 51,640

Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No: 41,786

1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756



30827

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE